

Literary Elements in Rāvaṇa's Grammatical Speech*

Yūto Kawamura

1 Introduction

The Bhaṭṭikāvya of Bhaṭṭi (ca. 7th c. CE) is known as a poetic work (*kāvya*) of the type called *kāvyaśāstra*. This work, telling the story of Rāma in the *kāvya* style, is meant for illustrating Pāṇini's grammatical rules in the grammatical sections and poetic issues in the poetic section.¹

Dasgupta and De 1943 make a quite negative valuation of the poetic aspects of the work:

. . . the difficult medium of a consciously laboured language is indeed a serious obstacle to their appreciation. What is a more serious drawback is that the poet has hardly any freedom of phraseology, which is conditioned strictly by the necessity of employing only those words whose grammatical forms have to be illustrated methodically in each stanza; and **all thought, feeling, idea or expression becomes only a slave to this exacting purpose**. . . . If one can labour through its hard and damaging crust of erudition, one will doubtless find a glimmering of fine and interesting things. But Bhaṭṭi is a writer of much less original inspiration than his contemporaries, and **his inspiration comes from a direction other than the purely poetic**. The work is a great triumph of artifice, and perhaps more reasonably accomplished than such later triumphs of artifice as proceed even to greater excesses; but that is a different thing from poetry. Bhaṭṭi's scholarliness has justly propitiated scholars, but **the self-imposed curse of artificiality neutralises whatever poetic gifts he really possesses**. Few read his worst, but even his best is seriously flawed by his unfortunate outlook; and, unless the delectable pursuit of poetry is regarded as a strenuous intellectual exercise, few can speak Bhaṭṭi's work with positive enthusiasm. (Dasgupta and De 1943: 184.4–185.5, emphasis mine)

I have shown in Kawamura 2017 that this estimation becomes open to doubt when one carefully examines poetic devices Bhaṭṭi plants in the grammatical sections.² The purpose of the present paper is to afford further evidence to support this point, focusing on BhK 8.70–84, a set of verses intended to illustrate the *kāraka* rules.

2 BhK 8.70–84 and the *kāraka* rules

The Aṣṭādhyāyī contains a section of rules introducing *kāraka* class names. These rules come under the heading (*adhikāra*) of A 1.4.23: *kārake* 'if . . . is a *kāraka*' that establishes the domain in which the class names are assigned by subsequent rules: these names apply to things when they are *kāra*kas, direct participants in actions. Six *kāraka* names are defined by A 1.4.24: *dhruvam apāye 'pādānam*–A

*I have benefited much from productive discussions with Professor Yūko Yokochi, Professor Andrey Klebanov, Dr. Lidia Szczepanik-Wojtczak, and Dr. Kiyokazu Okita on several points concerning Bhaṭṭi's expressions. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 15J06976.

¹On the structure of the Bhaṭṭikāvya, see Kawamura 2016: 154.

²See Kawamura 2017: §3 (209–248).

1.4.55: *tatprayojako hetuś ca: apādāna* ‘point of departure’, *sampradāna* ‘recipient’, *karaṇa* ‘instrument’, *adhikaraṇa* ‘locus’, *karman* ‘object’, *kartr* ‘agent’, in this order. There is a subtype of agents, a causal agent (*hetu*).

In BhK 8.70–84 all the *kāraka* rules are illustrated. The commentators Jayamaṅgala and Mallinātha call the section constituted by these verses the *kārakādhikāra*. These verses depict the scene where the demon king Rāvaṇa carries out a seduction of Sītā, who is confined in Laṅkā. The correspondence between the verses and the rules illustrated is as follows:

BhK 8.70–72 → A 1.4.24–31 (*apādāna*)

BhK 8.73–77 → A 1.4.32–41 (*sampradāna*)

BhK 8.78 → A 1.4.42–44 (*karaṇa*)

BhK 8.79–80 → A 1.4.45–48 (*adhikaraṇa*)

BhK 8.81–84 → A 1.4.49–53 (*karman*)

BhK 8.84 → A 1.4.54–55 (*kartr*, *hetu*)

In the following I will discuss some literary devices observed in this *kāraka* section, which have been overlooked not only by previous scholarship but also by traditional commentators on the Bhaṭṭikāvya.

2.1 BhK 8.76

As a beginning, let us consider BhK 8.76. The verse runs as follows:

BhK 8.76: *(a) saṅkrudhyasi mṛṣā kiṃ tvam didṛkṣum mām mṛgekṣaṇe |*

(b) īkṣitavyaṃ parastrībhyaḥ svadharmo rakṣasām ayam ||

“O doe-eyed lady, why are you needlessly furious at me when I seek to gaze at [you]? [I] must read the fortune of the women of others. This is demons’ own duty.”

2.1.1 Illustrations of A 1.4.38–39

(a) and (b) are to illustrate A 1.4.38: *krudhadruhor upasṛṣṭayoḥ karma* and A 1.4.39: *rādhikṣyor yasya vipraśnaḥ* respectively.

A 1.4.38: *krudhadruhor upasṛṣṭayoḥ karma ||*

“When related with [the actions denoted by] the verbs *krudh* ‘be angry’ and *druh* ‘wish harm to’ preceded by preverbs, that *kāraka* towards whom anger is felt is called *karman*.”

A 1.4.39: *rādhikṣyor yasya vipraśnaḥ ||*

“When related with [the actions denoted by] the verbs *rādh* ‘succeed’ and *īkṣ* ‘observe’, that *kāraka* as to whom various inquiries are carried out is called *sampradāna*.”³

³KV on A 1.4.39 (I.83.6–8): *vividhaḥ praśnaḥ vipraśnaḥ | sa kasya bhavati | yasya śubhāśubhaṃ prcchyate | devadattāya rādhyati | devadattāya īkṣate | naimittikaḥ prṣṭaḥ san devadattasya daivaṃ paryālocayatīty arthaḥ |* (“*vipraśna* means ‘various inquiries’. [Question] As to whom are these [inquiries] carried out? [Answer] To those whose good or bad luck is inquired. [Examples] *devadattāya rādhyati*, *devadattāya īkṣate*. What is meant by these examples is that an astrologer, when asked, reads Devadatta’s fortune.”)

In (a) *saṅkrudhyasi . . . mām* ‘you are furious at me’, Rāvaṇa referred to by the personal pronoun *asmad* is spoken of as the one against whom Sītā directs her anger, so that the former belongs to the *karman* class by dint of A 1.4.38. The word *mām* is derived by introducing the accusative ending *am* after *asmad* to denote a *karman* (A 2.3.2: *karmaṇi dvitīyā*). By (b) *īkṣitavyaṃ parastrībhyaḥ* ‘[I] must read the fortune of the women of others’, the situation is conveyed that Rāvaṇa conducts various inquiries (*vipraśna*) as to the women of others in order to read their omens. A 1.4.39 assigns the name *sampradāna* to these women. Thus the plural form *parastrībhyaḥ* has the fourth-triplet ending *bhyas* introduced by A 2.3.13: *caturthī sampradāne* to signify a *sampradāna*.

2.1.2 Sound Arrangement

For our purpose it is important to note that soft nasals are frequently repeated in the verse (*ṇ, ṇ, m, ṇ*). One may be justified in stating that this repetition functions as a device to convey softness in Rāvaṇa's speech: here he tries to soothe Sītā. On the other hand, the repetitive use of the harsh sound *kṣ* would serve to express some irritation he feels with her.⁴ This striking contrast between these two kinds of sounds creates the pulsating rhythm of the verse.⁵

The same device is found in BhK 8.79 and BhK 8.81. The continued repetition of soft nasals (*n, m, ṇ*) and harsh sibilants (*ś, ṣ, s*) in the former and that of nasal sounds (*ṇ, n, m, ṇ, ṇ*) and the voiceless strong sound *k* in the latter stand in open contrast, respectively.

BhK 8.79: (c) *āssva sākaṃ mayā saudhe* (d1) *mādhīṣṭhā nirjanaṃ vanam* |
(e) *mādhivātsīr bhuvam* (d2) *śayyām adhiśeṣva smarotsukā* ||⁶

“Stay with me in my palace. Do not stay in the deserted forest. Do not rest on the ground. Lie on the bed eager to make love.”

BhK 8.81: *māvamaṇsthā namasyantam akāryajñe jagatpatim* |
sandṛṣṭe mayi kākutstham adhanyaṃ kāmayeta kā ||

“Do not despise [me,] the lord of the world, when he bows [to you], O you ignorant of what is to be done. Can any woman desire the wretched offspring of Kakutstha (i.e., Rāma,) when they see me properly?”

For the illustration of A 1.4.49–50 in BhK 8.81, see §2.3.1. In BhK 8.79 (c)–(e) illustrate the following rules:

A 1.4.45: *ādhāro 'dhikaraṇam* ||

“That *kāraka* which serves as locus is called *adhikaraṇa*.”

A 1.4.46: *adhiśṇsthāsāṇ karma* ||

“That *kāraka* which serves as locus of the actions denoted by the verbs *śī*, *sthā*, and *ās* used with *adhi* (*adhi-śī* ‘lie on’; *adhi-sthā* ‘stand on, remain at’; *adhi-ās* ‘sit on, sit in, inhabit’) is called *karman*.”

A 1.4.48: *upānvadhyānvasaḥ* ||

⁴For similar types of poetic effects produced by sound arrangement and some concrete examples, see Yokochi 2008 and Lienhard 1984: 11.3–22; 182.33–183.22.

⁵Note that the sound *r* is also repeated in the verse. This sound can be considered either soft or harsh.

⁶The repetition of the aspirate *dh* is also noticeable.

“That kāraka which serves as locus of the actions denoted by the verb *vas* used with *upa*, *anu*, *adhi*, or *āN* (*upa-vas* ‘live near’; *anu-vas* ‘live along’; *adhi-vas* ‘live on’; *ā-vas* ‘live in, stay’) is called *karman*.”⁷

A locus (*ādhāra*) contributes to the accomplishment of an action by means of holding (*dhāraṇakriyā*) an agent (*kartr*) or an object (*karman*) wherein the action resides (*kriyāśraya*):⁸ The locus indirectly supports the action through the intermediary of the agent or the object.

In (c) *āssva* . . . *saudhe* ‘Stay [with me] in the palace’, the palace (*saudha*) serves as locus of the action of staying by means of holding *Sītā*, the agent of this action. It is therefore called *adhikaraṇa* by A 1.4.45. A 2.3.36: *saptamy adhikaraṇe ca* lets seventh-triplet endings occur to denote a locus (*adhikaraṇa*).

(d1) *mādhīṣṭhā* . . . *vanam* ‘Do not stay in the [deserted] forest’ and (d2) *śayyām adhiśeṣva* ‘Lie on the bed’ illustrate A 1.4.46. By supporting *Sītā* in whom reside the acts of staying and lying denoted by *adhi-sthā* and *adhi-śī* respectively, here the forest (*vana*) and the bed (*śayyā*) function as loci of these acts, so that they bear the class name *karman* by the rule in question.

A 1.4.48 is illustrated with (e) *mādhivātsīr bhuvam* ‘Do not rest on the ground’. The ground (*bhū*) is classed as *adhikaraṇa* by virtue of indirectly supporting the action of living (*adhi-vas*) performed by *Sītā*.

2.2 BhK 8.77

Let us next take up BhK 8.77:

BhK 8.77: (f) *śṛṇvadbhyaḥ pratiśṛṇvanti madhyamā bhīru nottamāḥ* |
(g) *grṇadbhyo ’nugṛṇanty anye ’kṛtārthā naiva madvidhāḥ* ||

[Interpretation 1] “Mediocre ones make a promise to their subjects (*śṛṇvadbhyaḥ*), O frightened lady, [but] not the best ones. Others, not having attained their objects (*akṛtārthāḥ*), urge praisers (*grṇadbhyaḥ*), [but] not those like me.”

[Interpretation 2] “Mediocre ones make a promise to those possessed of knowledge (*śṛṇvadbhyaḥ*), O frightened lady, [but] not the best ones since they have attained their objects (*kṛtārthāḥ*). Others urge flatterers (*grṇadbhyaḥ*), [but] not those like me.”⁹

2.2.1 Illustrations of A 1.4.40–41

(f) *śṛṇvadbhyaḥ pratiśṛṇvanti* ‘[Mediocre ones] make a promise to śṛṇvat people’ aims at illustrating A 1.4.40: *pratyānbhyām śruvaḥ pūrvasya kartā*:

A 1.4.40: *pratyānbhyām śruvaḥ pūrvasya kartā* ||

“When related with [the action denoted by] the verb *śru* preceded by *prati* or *āN* (*prati-śru/ā-śru* ‘promise’), that kāraka which serves as agent of a previous act is called *sampradāna*.”

⁷It is to be noted that the original meaning of the verb *vas* lies in the area of ‘stay overnight’.

⁸KV on A 1.4.45 (I.84.9–10): *ādhriyante ’smin kriyā ity ādhāraḥ* | *kartrkarmanoh kriyāśrayabhūtayoḥ dhāraṇakriyām prati ya ādhāraḥ tat kārakam adhikaraṇasañjñam bhavati* |

⁹Mallinātha reads *anye kṛtārthā* and Jayamaṅgala *anye ’kṛtārthā*. See notes 12 and 14.

The Kāśikāvṛtti and the Siddhāntakaumudī make the following explanations of this rule:

KV on A 1.4.40 (I.83.10–12): *pratipūrva āṇpūrvaś ca śṛṇotir abhyupagame pratijñāne vartate | sa cābhyupagamaḥ pareṇa prayuktasya sato bhavati | tatra prayoktā pūrvasyāḥ kriyāyā kartā sampradānasañjño bhavati |*

“The verb *śru* preceded by *prati* or *āṇ* occurs in the sense ‘agree’, that is, ‘promise’. And the action of agreeing takes place with respect to X when X is urged by Y. Here the one who urges (Y), the agent of the previous action, bears the name *sampradāna*.”

SK 578 (I.649.2–3): *viprāya gām pratiśṛṇoti āśṛṇoti vā | vipreṇa mahyaṃ dehīti pravartitas taṃ pratijānīta ity arthaḥ ||*

“[Example] *viprāya gām pratiśṛṇoti/āśṛṇoti* ‘. . . promises the Brahmin [to give] a cow.’ What is meant is: urged by a Brahmin with the order “Give me [a cow]”, X promises him [to give it].”

In the utterance *viprāya gām pratiśṛṇoti/āśṛṇoti* ‘. . . promises the Brahmin [to give] a cow’, the Brahmin serves as agent of the previous action, the action of urging, so that he belongs to the *sampradāna* class by A 1.4.40.

In (f) *śṛṇvadbhyaḥ pratiśṛṇvanti*, A 1.4.40 assigns the name *sampradāna* to the *śṛṇvat* people. The commentators Jayamaṅgala and Mallinātha present different interpretations of this phrase. In the first place, these *śṛṇvat* people are the agents of a previous action to be presupposed in (f). According to Jayamaṅgala, it is the act of asking (*prārthanakriyā*)—probably performed by subjects—their ordinary rulers (*madhyamāḥ prabhavaḥ*) to do something beneficial.

Subjects ask their rulers to do something beneficial → The rulers promise them to do it

Under this view, the underlying idea of the first half of BhK 8.77 is that, whilst ordinary rulers set to work only when asked by their subject to do something beneficial, the best ones take action voluntarily to gain benefits (*svayam eva hitaṃ pratipadyante*).¹⁰ Although Jayamaṅgala does not make clear in what sense the present participle *śṛṇvadbhyaḥ* is employed, he seems to take this word as meaning ‘subjects’.¹¹

Mallinātha, on the other hand, interprets this participle as meaning ‘those possessed of knowledge’ (*śrutaśālibhyaḥ*), that is to say, ‘those who teach what is beneficial and unbeneficial’ (*hitāhitam upadiśadbhyaḥ*), and advances the view that a previous action to be presupposed in (f) is their teaching (*upadeśakriyā*):

Those possessed of knowledge teach rulers what is beneficial and unbeneficial → The rulers promise them to behave in conformity with the instructions

Accordingly, the first half of BhK 8.77 comes to indicate the idea that while ordinary rulers can behave appropriately only with the help of instruction received from the learned, the best ones can do

¹⁰JM on BhK 8.77 (186.7–10): *śṛṇvadbhyaḥ prārthayamānebhyaḥ svāminn idaṃ kriyatām iti | madhyamāḥ prabhavaḥ pratiśṛṇvanti om ity upagacchanti | he bhīru nottamā mādrśāḥ | te hi svātantryāt svayam eva hitaṃ pratipadyanta iti bhāvaḥ | pratyāñbhyāṃ śruvaḥ pūrvasya karteti sampradānasañjñā | pūrvasyāḥ prārthanakriyāyāḥ prārthayitūḥ kartrivāt |*

¹¹In the context of politics, the present participle of the verb *śru* is sometimes used in the sense ‘obedient, attentive’. From this meaning, the sense ‘subjects’ could be derived. AŚ 2.1.25: *dāsāhitakabandhūn aśṛṇvato rājā vinayaṃ grāhayet ||* (Olivelle 2013: 100.27–28: “The king should enforce discipline on slaves, persons given as pledges, and relatives, when they fail to obey.”)

so by themselves (*na paropadeśāpekṣāḥ*) because they know what is to be done and not to be done (*kāryākāryajñāḥ*).¹²

What is illustrated with (g) *gr̥ṇadbhyaḥ anugr̥ṇanti* ‘others urge gr̥ṇat people’ is A 1.4.41: *anupratigr̥ṇas ca*:

A 1.4.41: *anupratigr̥ṇas ca* ||

“When related with [the actions denoted by] the verb *gr̥* preceded by *anu* or *prati* (*anu-gr̥* ‘inspire’; *prati-gr̥* ‘respond, instigate’), that *kāraka* which serves as agent of a previous act is called *sampradāna*.”¹³

The gr̥ṇat people who serve as agents of a previous action to be assumed in (g) are classed as *sampradāna* by this rule. Again, Jayamaṅgala’s and Mallinātha’s interpretations are not in accord.

Jayamaṅgala says that in the first instance ministers (*mantrin*) praise a good servant (*anugrāhyasya bhr̥tyasya*) and then the ordinary rulers urge the former to keep doing so (*protsāhayanti*). Thus, according to Jayamaṅgala, the previous action is the act of praising performed by the ministers (*stutikriyā*). Even though I have failed to grasp the point in this view, he seems to consider that the ordinary rulers cause the ministers to praise the good servant so as to invite him to place himself under their orders (*mamānugato bhavati*).¹⁴ In the light of Mallinātha’s interpretation, the gist of the second half of the verse is this. Ordinary rulers, by dangling before the sycophants the possibility of giving a reward, cause the latter to keep praising them (*ditsāsūcakālāpaiḥ protsāhayanti*).

Subjects eulogize their rulers → The rulers urge them to continue doing so

On the other hand, the best ones, even without being praised (*stutiṃ vinā*), makes offerings to others such as petitioners (*arthibhyaḥ prayacchanti*).¹⁵

In my opinion, both of Jayamaṅgala’s and Mallinātha’s interpretations are possible in each case.

¹²SP on BhK 8.77 (I.286.6–13): *anye madvyatiriktāḥ madhyamāḥ śṛṇvadbhyaḥ śrutaśālibhyaḥ | idam kāryam idam akāryam iti hitāhitam upadiśadbhya ity arthaḥ | pratiśṛṇvanti abhyupagacchanti | tathaiva kurma iti prati-jānata ity arthaḥ | . . . pratyānbhyaṃ śruvaḥ pūrvasya karteti śṛṇvatām sampradānatvam | teṣāṃ pratiśravāpekṣayā pūrvasyām upadeśakriyāyām kartṛtvād iti | kṛtārthāḥ kṛtakṛtyāḥ svayam eva kāryākāryajñā madvidhā uttamās tu naivaṃ | na paropadeśāpekṣā ity arthaḥ |*

¹³KV on A 1.4.41 (I.83.16–17): *hotre ’nugr̥ṇāti | hotā prathamam śamsati tam anyāḥ protsāhayati | anugaraḥ pratigara iti hi śamsituḥ protsāhane vartate | hotre ’nugr̥ṇāti hotāram śamsantam protsāhayatīty arthaḥ |* (“[Example] *hotre ’nugr̥ṇāti* ‘[the Adhvaryu] inspires the Hotṛ’. [This means that] the Hotṛ recites first and then the other (the Adhvaryu) inspires him (*protsāhayati*). As is well known, the words *anugara* and *pratigara* occur in the sense of ‘recitor-inspiring [formula]’ (*śamsituḥ protsāhane*). What is meant by the instance *hotre ’nugr̥ṇāti* is: ‘[the Adhvaryu] inspires the Hotṛ when the latter is reciting’ (*hotāram śamsantam protsāhayati*)”) SK 579 (I.649.5): *hotā prathamam śamsati tam adhvaryuḥ protsāhayatīty arthaḥ |*

¹⁴JM on BhK 8.77 (186.11–14): *anye prabhavo ’kṛtārthā alabdhalābhā gr̥ṇadbhyo ’nugrāhyasya bhr̥tyasya kasyacin *stutiṃ karvadbhyo [read: kurvadbhyo] mantribhyaḥ anugr̥ṇanti tān protsāhayanti | anugr̥ṇita anugr̥ṇiteti [gr̥ṇita gr̥ṇiteti?] mamānugato bhavātīti | naiva madvidhā anugr̥ṇanti kṛtārthatvāt | gr̥ śabda ity asya prayoge anupratigr̥ṇas ceti sampradānasañjñā | gr̥ṇateḥ stutikriyāpekṣayā kartṛtvāt |* *I have emended the reading *na stutiṃ* to *stutiṃ*: there is no negative particle in BhK 8.77 and hence the former reading is inconsistent with the verse.

¹⁵SP on BhK 8.77 (I.286.13–15): *kiñca pūrvoktā madhyamāḥ gr̥ṇadbhyaḥ śamsadbhyaḥ stāvakebhyaḥ anugr̥ṇanti ditsāsūcakālāpaiḥ protsāhayanti | madvidhās tūttamāḥ stutiṃ vinaivārthibhyaḥ prayacchantīty arthaḥ |*

2.2.2 Wurzel-Yamaka

Utterances (f) *śṛṇvadbhyaḥ pratiśṛṇvanti* and (g) *grṇadbhyo 'nugrṇanti* serve a literary purpose also. The present participle *śṛṇvadbhyaḥ* construed with the verbal form *pratiśṛṇvanti* is derived from the same verb as the latter, *śru*. The same is true of the present participle *grṇadbhyaḥ* construed with the verbal form *anugrṇanti*: both are derived from the same verb *gr*. This is a poetic device of the type which Hahn 2007 calls “Wurzel-Yamaka” (*dhātuyamaka*).¹⁶

2.3 BhK 8.81

Finally, let us look into BhK 8.81.

BhK 8.81: *(h)māvamaṁsthā namasyantam akāryajñe jagatpatim |*
sandr̥ṣṭe mayi (i)kākutstham adhanyaṁ kāmāyeta kā ||

“Do not despise [me,] (*māvamaṁsthā*) the lord of the world (*jagatpatim*), when he bows [to you] (*namasyantam*), O you ignorant of what is to be done (*akāryajñe*).¹⁷ Can any woman desire (*kāmāyeta kā*) the wretched offspring of Kakutstha (i.e., Rāma, *kākutstham adhanyaṁ*) when they see me properly (*sandr̥ṣṭe mayi*)?”

2.3.1 Illustrations of A 1.4.49–50

(h) *māvamaṁsthā* . . . *jagatpatim* ‘Do not despise [me,] the lord of the world’ and (i) *kākutstham* . . . *kāmāyeta* ‘Can [any woman] desire the [wretched] offspring of Kakutstha (i.e., Rāma)?’ are intended to illustrate A 1.4.49: *kartur īpsitatamaṁ karma* and A 1.4.50: *tathāyuktaṁ cānīpsitam*, respectively.

A 1.4.49: *kartur īpsitatamaṁ karma ||*

“That *kāraka* which an agent of an action most wishes to reach/obtain through the action is called *karman*.”

[Examples from the Kāśikāvṛtti (I.85.6)]

[1] *kaṭaṁ karoti* ‘. . . is making a mat.’

[2] *grāmaṁ gacchati* ‘. . . is going to the village.’

A 1.4.50: *tathāyuktaṁ cānīpsitam ||*

“That *kāraka* which is related to an action in the same way as a thing classed as *karman* by 1.4.49 but is either hateful or indifferent is called *karman*.”

[Examples from the Kāśikāvṛtti (I.85.14–15)]

¹⁶See this article for further details. Note, in passing, that this sort of device is already found in the earliest poetry of India, the Ṛgveda. For example: RV VI.18.15: *ānu dyāvāprthivī tāt ta ōjo amartīyā jihata indra devāḥ | kṛṣvā kṛtno ākṛtaṁ yāt te āsti ukthāṁ nāvīyo janayasva yajñāiḥ ||* (Jamison and Brereton 2014: 798.21–24: “Heaven and Earth and the immortal gods give way to your might, Indra. Do, o doer, what undone (deed) exists for you (to do). Generate a newer hymn for yourself along with sacrifices.”)

¹⁷Rāvaṇa is the lord of the world and hence for him people should show respect. Such a great person now bows to Sītā (*jagannamasyo 'py 'haṁ tvāṁ namasyāmi*). It is therefore inappropriate for her to disrespect him (*iti nāvajñā yuktā*). MB on BhK 8.81 (I.579.4–6): *he akāryajñe 'viśeṣajñe namasyantaṁ praṇamantaṁ jagatpatim māṁ tvaṁ māvamaṁsthā nāvajñāthi | jagannamasyo 'py 'haṁ tvāṁ namasyāmīti nāvajñā yukteti bhāvaḥ |*

[3] *viṣam bhakṣayati* ‘. . . eats poison.’

[4] *caurān paśyati* ‘. . . sees the thieves.’

[5] *grāmaṃ gacchan vr̥kṣamūlāny upasarpati* ‘. . . [happens to] come near to the roots of a tree while going to the village.’

According to Pāṇinīyas, a *kāraka*-entity to be assigned to the *karman* category by A 1.4.49 has three subtypes: that which is to be (a) made (*nirvartya*, example [1]), (b) modified (*vikārya*), and (c) reached/obtained (*prāpya*, example [2]).¹⁸ Furthermore, a *kāraka*-entity to be termed *karman* by A 1.4.50 has two subtypes: (a) that which is not desired by, hateful to, an agent (*dveṣya*, examples [3]–[4]) and (b) that to which an agent is indifferent (*upekṣya*, example [5]). The function of the negative particle *nañ* in the term *anīpsita* of A 1.4.50 is traditionally taken as ‘exclusion’ (*paryudāsa*), so that this term covers both these types of *karman*.¹⁹ Consequently, in examples [3]–[5] the poison and the thieves, which are hateful to the agent, and the tree roots, towards which he is neutral, bear the name *karman* by the rule at issue.

Jayamaṅgala and Mallinātha put forward the same view that A 1.4.49 is illustrated by (h) and A 1.4.50 by (i): in the former Rāvaṇa (*jagatpati*) is spoken of as the one whom Sītā wishes to reach through the act of despising (*īpsitatama*), that is, it is he who is the target for her scorn; and in the latter Rāma (*kākutstha*) is spoken of as hateful to women (*anīpsita*, *dveṣya*) from Rāvaṇa’s viewpoint.²⁰ This interpretation is harmonious with Bhaṭṭi’s general principle in illustrating grammatical rules: he arranges words illustrating the rules in the order they are formulated in the Aṣṭādhyāyī.²¹

2.3.2 Doubled Speech

It is worth pointing out that the verse under consideration can be also interpreted in such a way that Rāvaṇa praises Rāma and puts himself down unintentionally:

BhK 8.81: *māvamaṁsthā namasyantam akāryajñe jagatpatim* |

sandr̥ṣṭe mayi kākutstham adhanyam kāmayera kā ||

“Do not despise (*māvamaṁsthā*) the offspring of Kakutstha (i.e., Rāma, *kākutstham*), the lord of the world (*jagatpatim*). Can any woman desire [me] (*kāmayera kā*) who is wretched (*adhanyam*) and bows to [him] (*namasyantam*) when they properly see me (*sandr̥ṣṭe mayi*) ignorant of what is to be done (*akāryajñe*)?”

¹⁸See Cardona 1974: 279–280, note 1; 281, note 7a. KV on A 3.2.1 (I.211.1): *trividhaṃ karma nirvartyaṃ vikāryaṃ prāpyaṃ ceti* |

¹⁹TB on SK 538 (I.603.24–26): *īpsitād anyad anīpsitam iti paryudāso ’yam | tena yad upekṣyaṃ yac ca dveṣyaṃ tad dvayam apīha gr̥hyata ity āśayenādyam udāharati—grāmaṃ gacchaṁs tṛṇaṃ spr̥śatīti* || KV on A 1.4.50 (I.85.13–14): *yena prakāreṇa kartur īpsitatamaṃ kriyayā yujyate tenaiva cet prakāreṇa yad anīpsitam yuktaṃ bhavati tasya karmasañjñā vidhīyate | īpsitād anyat sarvaṃ anīpsitam dveṣyaṃ itarac ca* |

²⁰JM on BhK 8.81 (187.10–13): *kartur īpsitatamam iti karmasañjñā | avamānakriyayā karṭṣambandhinyā jagatpater āptum iṣṭatvāt | sandr̥ṣṭe mayi kākutstham adhanyam mandabhāgyam kā kāmayera kā icchet | naivety arthaḥ | tathāyuktaṃ cānīpsitam iti karmasañjñā | yenaiva prakāreṇa kartur īpsitatamaṃ kriyayā yuktaṃ tenaivepsitād anyasya rāmasya prayujyamānatvāt*; SP on BhK 8.81 (I.288.3–7): *jagatpatiṃ jagadvandyaṃ māṃ māvamaṁsthā māvamanyasva | manyateḥ kartari luṇi thās | kartur īpsitatamaṃ karmeti jagatpateḥ karmatvam | mayi sandr̥ṣṭe saty adhanyam abhāgyam kākutstham rāmam | tathāyuktaṃ cānīpsitam iti rāmasyānīpsitakarmatvam || kā strī kāmayera | na kṛpīty arthaḥ ||*

²¹See Kawamura 2017: §3.1 (411–412).

Thus Rāvaṇa's speech in this verse can be read to convey either scorn or praise. A typical example of this bitextual device is found in Vallabhadeva's (ca. beginning of 10th c. CE) version of Śiśupāla's denunciation of Kṛṣṇa (ŚV 15.14–47). This version contains two simultaneous registers of meaning: one denounces Kṛṣṇa who has humble social origins; the other praises him as the Supreme God.²²

3 Concluding Remarks

In the grammatical sections of his work, Bhaṭṭi does not devote all his energies to illustrating Pāṇinian rules, but occasionally also interweaves literary devices with his illustrations, as we have seen above: Bhaṭṭi is sensitive to the poetic aspects of even the most grammatically oriented section.

It seems to me that, in dealing with the grammatical sections, few scholars have paid due attention to Bhaṭṭi's poetic strategies applied therein. First and foremost, the Bhaṭṭikāvya is composed in the kāvya style; and this work is traditionally viewed as belonging to the category called *mahākāvya* 'grand poem'. One should not miss the significance of this fact.

Abbreviations and References

- A: Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. See Appendix III (Aṣṭādhyāyīsūtrapāṭha) in Cardona 1997.
 AŚ: Kauṭilya's *Arthaśāstra*. See Kangle 1969.
 BhK: Bhaṭṭi's *Bhaṭṭikāvya*. See (1) Bāpata 1887; (2) Trivedī 1898.
 JM: Jayamaṅgala's *Jayamaṅgalā*. See Bāpata 1887.
 KV: Jayāditya and Vāmana's *Kāśikāvṛtti*. See Aryendra Sharma, Khanderao Deshpande, and D. G. Padhye 1969–1970.
 MB: Bharatamallika's *Mugdhabodhinī*. *Bhaṭṭikāvya: A Poem on the Actions of Rama*. With the commentaries of Jayamangala and Bharatamallika. Published for the use of the Sanskrit College. Under the authority of the committee of public instruction. 2 vols. Calcutta: Education Press, 1828.
 RV: *R̥gveda*. See Aufrecht 1877.
 SP: Mallinātha's *Sarvathānā*. See Trivedī 1898.
 ŚV: Māgha's *Śiśupālavadha*. See Kak and Shastri 1990.
 TB: Jñānendrasarasvatī's *Tattvabodhinī*. See Caturveda and Bhāskara 1958–1961.
 Aryendra Sharma, Khanderao Deshpande, and D. G. Padhye
 1969–1970 *Kāśikā: A Commentary on Pāṇini's Grammar by Vāmana & Jayāditya*. Sanskrit Academy Series 17, 20. 2 vols. Hyderabad: Sanskrit Academy.
 Aufrecht, Theodor
 1877 *Die Hymnen des R̥gveda*. 2 vols. Bonn: Adolph Marcus.
 Bāpata, Govinda Shankara Shāstrī
 1887 *The Bhaṭṭikāvya of Bhaṭṭi with the Commentary (Jayamangalā) of Jayamangala*. Bombay: Nirṇaya Sāgara Press.
 Bronner, Yigal and Lawrence McCrea
 2012 "To Be or Not to Be Śiśupāla: Which Version of the Key Speech in Māgha's Great Poem Did He Really Write." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 132-3: 427–455.
 Cardona, George
 1974 "Pāṇini's kārakas: Agency, Animation, and Identity." *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 2: 231–306.
 1997 *Pāṇini: His Work and its Traditions. Volume One. Background and Introduction*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1988. Second edition, revised and enlarged, 1997.
 2012 "On the Construction type *naṭasya śṛṇoti*." *Samskṛtavimarsaḥ* 6: 65–84.

²²See Bronner and McCrea 2012 for details.

- Caturveda, Giridhara Śarmā, and Parameśvarānanda Śarmā Bhāskara
 1958–1961 *Śrīmadbhaṭṭojīdīkṣitaviracitā vaiyākaraṇasiddhāntakaumudī śrīmadvāsudevādīkṣitapraṇītayā bālaṃmanoramākhyavyākhyayā śrīmajjñānendrasarasvatīviracitayā tattvabodhinīvyākhyavyākhyayā ca sanāthitā*. 4 vols. Varanasi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Fallon, Oliver
 2009 *Bhaṭṭi's Poem: The Death of Rāvaṇa by Bhaṭṭi*. The Clay Sanskrit Library 45. New York: New York University Press and the JJC Foundation.
- Hahn, Michael
 2007 “Unnütze Spielereien?: Zur Frage des Sinnes der figurativen Dichtung in der Sanskritliteratur.” *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 24: 67–89.
- Jamison, Stephanie W. and Joel P. Brereton
 2014 *The Rīgveda: The Earliest Religious Poetry of India*. 3 vols. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kak, Ram Chandra and Harabhatta Shastri
 1990 *Māghabhaṭṭa's Śīsupālavadha: The Commentary (Sandeha-Viṣauṣadhi) of Vallabhadeva (Complete)*. Shrinagar: Kashmir Mercantile Press, 1935 (but with preface dated to 1941). Reprint, Delhi: Bharatiya Book Corporation, 1990.
- Kangle, R. P.
 1969 *The Kauṭīlīya Arthaśāstra*. Part I. A critical edition with a glossary. University of Bombay Studies Sanskrit, Prakrit and Pali, No. 1. Bombay: University of Bombay, 1960. Second edition, 1969.
- Kawamura, Yūto
 2016 “Illustrations of Aṣṭādhyāyī 1.3.29 in the Mahābhāṣya and the Bhaṭṭikāvya.” In *Vyākaraṇa-paripṛcchā: Proceedings of the Vyākaraṇa Section of the 16th World Sanskrit Conference*, ed. George Cardona and Hideyo Ogawa, 153–174. New Delhi: DK Publishers Distributors.
 2017 *The Decryption of the Bhaṭṭikāvya: Sanskrit Court Poetry and Pāṇinian Grammar*. Kyoto: Hozōkan. [In Japanese with English summary (401–423).]
- Lienhard, Siegfried
 1984 *A History of Classical Poetry: Sanskrit—Pāli—Prakrit*. A History of Indian Literature Volume. III, Fasc. 1. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Olivelle, Patrick
 2013 *King, Governance, and Law in Ancient India: Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra*. A new annotated translation. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Trivedī, Kamalāśaṅkara Prāṇaśaṅkara
 1898 *The Bhaṭṭi-Kāvya or Rāvaṇavadha Composed by Śrī Bhaṭṭi: Edited with the Commentary of Mallinātha and with Critical and Explanatory Notes*. Bombay Sanskrit Series 56–57. 2 vols. Bombay: Government Central Book Depot.
- Yokochi Yūko (横地優子)
 2008 “Sansukuritto shi no rikai ni mukete.” *サンスクリット詩の理解に向けて*. “Tagengo shakai ni okeru bungaku no rekishi teki tenkai to genzai: Indo bungaku o zirei toshite” Heisei 17 nendo~heisei 19 nendo kagaku kenkyūhi hojokin kiban kenkyū (A) kenkyū seika hōkoku sho (kenkyū daihyōsha: Mizuno Yoshihumi) 『多言語社会における文学の歴史的展開と現在：インド文学を事例として』平成17年度～平成19年度科学研究費補助金基盤研究 (A) 研究成果報告書 (研究代表者：水野善文), pp. 101–114.

(Yūto Kawamura, JSPS Research Fellow [Indian Philosophy])

ラーヴァナの言葉に織り込まれた文学技巧

川村 悠人

バツティ作 Bhaṭṭikāvya は、詩文論書 (kāvyasāstra) と呼ばれる範疇に属する作品として知られる。同書は、ラーマ物語を美文体で語りつつ、その文法学部門においてパーニニの文法規則を、詩学部門において詩学の諸規定を、それぞれ例証することを企図したものである。Dasgupta and De 1943: 184.4–185.5 は同作品の詩的価値を極めて否定的に評するが、川村 2017: 209–248 で示したように、そのような評価は、文法学部門の至る所に仕掛けられた詩的技巧を詳細に検討するとき、不適切であることが判明する。本稿は、kāra 術語規則が例証される BhK 8.70–84 に焦点をあて、この点を支持するさらなる証拠を提供しようとするものである。以下に論じる文学技巧は、現代の研究者だけでなく伝統的注釈者たちによっても見落とされているものである。

まず、(a) A 1.4.38: krudhadruhor upasrṣṭayoh karma と (b) A 1.4.39: rādhīkṣyor yasya viprasṇaḥ を例証する BhK 8.76 において、特定の音が意図的に反復されている。

BhK 8.76: (a) saṅkrudhyasi mṛṣā kiṃ tvam didrṣuṃ mām mṛgeksaṇe |

(b) īkṣitavyam parastrībhyah svadharmo rakṣasām ayam ||

「お前（シーター）はどうして無意味に腹を立てるのか、[お前に] 目をやろうとする俺（ラーヴァナ）に。鹿のような眼の女よ。[俺は] 吟味せねばならない、他人の妻らの吉凶を。これは悪魔の本務である」

柔らかい鼻音 (ṅ, ṇ, m, ṁ) の反復はシーターをなだめようとするラーヴァナの言葉の穏やかさを伝える点に、荒い kṣ 音の反復はそこに潜む苛立ちを伝える点に、詩的效果をあげている。これら二種の音の明確な対照は詩に律動を生む。

同種の詩的技巧は、(c) A 1.4.45: ādhāro 'dhikaraṇam と (d) A 1.4.46: adhiśīsthāsān karma 並びに (e) A 1.4.48: upānvadhyānvasaḥ を例証する BhK 8.79 と、(f) A 1.4.49: kartur īpsitatamaṃ karma と (g) A 1.4.50: tathāyuktaṃ cānīpsitam を例証する BhK 8.81 にも観察される。

BhK 8.79: (c) āssva sākam mayā saudhe (d1) mādhīsthā nirjanam vanam |

(e) mādhivātsīr bhuvaṃ (d2) śayyām adhiśeṣva smarotsukā ||

「お前は俺と一緒に宮殿に住め。人のいない森にいてはならない。地の上で暮らしてはならない。寝床の上に横たわれ、愛を熱望して」

BhK 8.81: (f) māvamamsthā namasyantam akāryajñe jagatpatim |

sandrṣṭe mayi (g) kākutstham adhanyam kāmayeta kā ||

[自身の賞賛とラーマの非難] 「お前は見下してはならない、頭を垂れる世界の主を。なすべきことが分からない女よ。俺をしかと目にしたならば、不幸なラーマをどの女が望むだろうか」

[意図せぬ自身の卑下とラーマの賞賛] 「お前は見下してはならない、世界の主ラーマを。なすべきことが分からない俺をしかと目にしたならば、不幸で [彼に] 頭を垂れる [俺] をどの女が望むだろうか」

BhK 8.79 では柔らかい鼻音 (ṅ, ṇ, m, ṁ) ときつい歯擦音 (ś, ṣ, s) の繰り返しが、BhK 8.81 は柔らかい鼻音 (ṅ, ṇ, m, ṁ, ṁ) と強く響く k 音の繰り返しが対照をなす。加えて、後者の詩節は、語順を入れ替えることによりラーヴァナの言葉に二つの意味が現れるよう構成されている (bitextual speech)。

(h) A 1.4.40: pratyānbhyām śruvaḥ pūrvasya kartā と (i) A 1.4.41: anupratigrṇaś ca を例証する表現には Hahn 2007 が Wurzel-Yamaka と名付けた技巧（同一の動詞語基から派生する諸語を繰り返す技巧）が見られる。

BhK 8.77: (h)śṛṇvadbhyaḥ pratiśṛṇvanti madhyamā bhīru nottamāḥ |

(i)grṇadbhyo 'nugṛṇanty anye 'kṛtārthā naiva madvidhāḥ ||

[解釈 1] 「部下たちに中位の者たちは約束するが、怯える女よ、上位の者たちはそんなことはしない。目的をとげていない (akṛtārthāḥ) 他の者たちは賞賛者を煽動するが、俺のような者たちは決してそんなことはしない」

[解釈 2] 「学識豊かな者たちに中位の者たちは約束するが、怯える女よ、上位の者たちはそんなことはしない。目的をとげているから (kṛtārthāḥ)。他の者たちは賞賛者を煽動するが、俺のような者たちは決してそんなことはしない」

現在分詞 śṛṇvadbhyaḥ と定動詞形 pratiśṛṇvanti はともに動詞語基 śru から、現在分詞 grṇadbhyaḥ と定動詞形 anugṛṇanti はともに動詞語基 gr から、それぞれ派生する語である。

以上のように、バツティは文法学部門において規則例証のみに専心しているわけではない。彼は種々の文学技巧をときおり規則例証表現の中に織り交ぜている。バツティのこのような詩的戦略はこれまで看過されてきた。まずもって、Bhaṭṭikāvya は詩文 (kāvyā) であり、伝統的に大詩文 (mahākāvya) の称号を与えられている作品である。この事実の意義を軽視してはならない。